

statutory subject matter.

Regarding claims 13-21, which are directed towards an encoding and decoding apparatus, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are drawn towards statutory subject matter. MPEP 2106(IV)(c) states: “while abstract ideas, natural phenomena, and laws of nature are not eligible for patenting, methods and products employing abstract ideas, natural phenomena, and laws of nature to perform a real-world function may be. In evaluating whether a claim meets the requirements of section 101, the claim must be considered as a whole to determine whether it is for a particular application of an abstract idea, natural phenomenon, or law of nature, and not for the abstract idea, natural phenomenon, or law of nature itself.” The inventions recited by claims 13-21 each perform real-world functions of encoding and decoding data. The Examiner has not considered these claims as a whole, but rather has singled out one element of these claims, i.e., a transmission channel, and ignored the other elements of the claims, such as, for example, the first soft encoder, the second soft encoder, the first soft decoder, and the second soft decoder recited in claim 13, which each correspond to statutory subject matter. It is respectfully submitted that when claims 13-21 are considered as a whole, these claims should be classified as statutory subject matter. Accordingly, the classification of these claims as non-statutory should be withdrawn.

Regarding claims 34-42 and 45, which are respectively directed towards an encoding and decoding method and a computer readable medium storing a computer program to execute an encoding and decoding method, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are also drawn towards statutory subject matter. Claims 34-42 and 45 do not specifically recite a “transmission channel” as an element of the claims. Claim 34 recites: “An encoding and decoding method, comprising...soft-decoding data input through a transmission channel...,” and claim 45 recites: “a computer readable readable medium storing a computer program to execute an encoding and decoding method, comprising...soft-decoding data input through a transmission channel...” The Examiner is incorrectly classifying claims 34-42 and 45 as nonstatutory simply because these claims recite that data is input through a transmission channel, even though these claims as a whole are drawn towards methods and computer programs which perform the real-world functions of encoding and decoding data. If the Examiner’s reasoning were correct, then any claim reciting any natural phenomenon could be classified as nonstatutory subject matter, regardless of whether the overall claim is directed towards statutory subject matter. As MPEP 2106(IV)(c) explains, the Examiner’s reasoning in this case is impermissible. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner re-classify claims 13-21, 34-42, and 45 as claims

drawn towards statutory subject matter.

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments, arguments and remarks, all claims are deemed to be allowable and this application is believed to be in condition for allowance.

If any further fees are required in connection with the filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our deposit account number 503333.

Should any questions remain unresolved, the Examiner is requested to telephone Applicants' attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

STEIN, MCEWEN & BUI, LLP

Date: _____

7/19/07

By: _____



Michael D. Stein
Registration No. 37,240

1400 Eye St., NW., Ste 300
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 216-9505
Facsimile: (202) 216-9510